HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 30 Saturday, July 28, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

The Stassen Revolt: Republican professionals, reviewing the Stassen affair, have come to the conclusion that it would have been nipped in the bud, to the benefit of the GOP, if it had not been for the second illness of the President. The recovery from the abdominal surgery has obviously taxed the President's strength and limited his activities. Ike — remark the pros — could have scotched the incipient revolt, at several stages, as follows:

(1) At Gettysburg, before he went to Panama, the President received Nixon and privately, it is believed, talked as if he wanted Nixon as the Vice-Presidential candidate. So, at least, Press Secretary Hagerty intimated. But, if Ike had been in full form, he could have checkmated the plans of Stassen permanently, by walking out and posing with Nixon before the cameras. Many press people have wondered why this was not done. Certainly, a newsphoto of the twain would have clinched the whole question.

(2) On Wednesday, July 18 — according to our sources — Stassen sent word to the White House that he wanted to see the President before the latter took off for Panama. He also conveyed word as to exactly what he wanted to talk about — the Vice-Presidency. At that moment, the President could have probably killed the Stassen revolt, by refusing Stassen an appointment to talk about the matter. Instead he saw the Minnesotan, listened to his story and allowed him to depart without giving some definite sign of Presidential disapproval. That — the pros say — is pardonable in a convalescent, but not in a well man.

Newsies on the sidelines speculate that Assistant President Sherman Adams who guards the President's door must have allowed Stassen to see him. Many believe Adams has his eye on the Vice-Presidential nomination himself and might have seen in Herter a convenient stalking-horse. See HUMAN EVENTS stories, "Operation X," June 23 and "What Price Nixon?" on July 21, which gave advance knowledge of the background of the present affair.

The pros persist in believing—despite his denial — that Paul Hoffman of Fund for the Republic fame was prominent among a powerful group behind Stassen, and that Hoffman probably put $25,000 into Stassen's poll-taking.

These professionals, admiring the alertness and dispatch with which Chairman Len Hall and Dick Nixon handled the matter early this week, live in the hope that, as the President gets better, he will act with vigor; they would like to see him stamp out the embers of the Stassen flare-up. He could do it — they say — either by firing Stassen from the Cabinet, or by flatly asking for Nixon as his running mate.

Finally, the pros have a feeling that unless the President does so act, the GOP will have a political handicap of great magnitude in the coming election.

Not Merely Gossip: There is a movement afoot to persuade General MacArthur to run for Senator in New York. Those behind it believe Dewey (who could probably have the nomination if he wanted it) does not want it and believe him when he says in private that he absolutely will not take the honor. Also, Attorney General Javits, the only high elected state official who is Republican, reportedly would have little chance of winning if he ran as Senator. But, the General — it is believed — could win the seat.

● T. Coleman Andrews' name is being tossed in the ring for President, as a result of many well-attended speeches which he has been giving in the East on the subject of the income tax. His following is growing, but probably is not big enough to get him on the ballot in any considerable number of states. However, a write-in campaign for him in November might well prove interesting.

● Ike at Panama reportedly tried to drum up support among Latin American presidents to help the U.S. delegation in the UN defeat any attempt to admit Red China to that body next November. It is felt that such an attempt will be made with

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much chance of success. American experts calculate that if the U.S. has support of the Latin-American bloc in the UN Assembly, plus Ireland, Turkey, Spain, Portugal and a number of others, any such move to bring in the Reds can be blocked.

● Capitol Hill conservatives are shouting, "I told you so," at news that Russia has backed down from her offer to build the Aswan Dam for Egypt. Conservatives have contended that the talk of a big export drive by Russia is mostly bluff; that we should not be blackmailed into "give-away" projects by talk of such a spectre. The Eisenhower Administration declined to commit us to a building of the Aswan Dam. In the past week, the Russians apparently caved in on their pretense they would construct the project. This — it is said — is one more proof that we can save money by resisting economic blackmail.

● The family and friends of the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada have indicated that they would prefer to see the Senator's former secretary, Jay B. Sourwine, get the Democratic nomination for Senator in that state. Sourwine closely follows the Senator's ideas and was until recently Counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In the primaries he may face incumbent Senator Bible (whose "No, I won't run," and "Yes, I guess I will" has thrown Democratic politicians into a tizzy). Support of the McCarran clan may swing the nomination to Sourwine. However, reportedly, Sourwine needs financial help to wage the fight.

● A book event to come next winter will be a volume on states' rights (to be published by Regnery, Chicago), by the editor of the *Richmond News Leader* — Jack Kilpatrick — frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS, and author of the July 14 article, "Mr. Dooley In a Campaign Year." Kilpatrick is credited with the dissemination of the idea of "interposition" as a weapon, in the South, to fight desegregation in the schools.

● Observers noted, but few newspaper reporters did, the following words from Senator Ralph Flanders (R., Vt.), who just about two years ago started his drive to censure Senator McCarthy. Flanders spoke them on the floor of the Senate, on July 19, as they appeared in the *Congressional Record* of that date, page 12318: "Mr. Flanders: I merely wish to say a word of friendliness to the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I have respected him. I have had admiration for him. I had had and do have affection for him and I am the sorriest person in this Chamber that this subject [censure of McCarthy] should arise again. . . . Let me say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that . . . I would rather not dig into those days. In my mind they have gone. I have drawn a veil over them, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin is to me as though they never existed. Mr. McCarthy [replied]: I believe that veil conceals a great many things that will one day come to light."

Three Conservative Victories: Political observers here are pointing out that Conservatism won three significant victories in the past session of the 84th Congress.

Defeat of Federal aid to school construction was first in importance. Several Southern Congressmen absented themselves from the roll call on the Powell amendment prohibiting aid to anti-integration states. They wanted the amendment passed to insure ultimate defeat of the bill. Many anti-aid GOP members voted for the Powell amendment to dramatize the Democratic split.

The second victory — little known except in Washington — was the renewal of the private transit franchise in the District of Columbia. A year ago, a long transit strike gave the Morses and the Lehmans in the Senate and the liberal *Washington Post* a chance to demand a D. C. public transit authority. But Congressional advocates of private ownership fought back, risking the usual charges of having been "bribed" by the transit company. After Louis Wolfson agreed to sell his transit stock, Congress voted a new franchise. The leftists' defeat was so overwhelming they did not even ask for a record vote.

Victory No. 3 was on Hell's Canyon. To provide a campaign issue, Democratic Chairman Paul Butler insisted that the Democratically controlled Congress must authorize Federal construction of the high dam. Officially estimated cost to Federal taxpayers, $388 million, but past experience suggests a more probable cost of twice that sum. The bill was defeated 51-41, eight Democrats voting against it.

Realignment: Amid the shouts and murmurs of the fight over the civil rights legislation (that is, the battle to corral the Negro vote), the murmurs assumed the most significance. Observers on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capitol Hill cannot recall a situation in which Republican members manifested so much private rebellious feeling against the "get the Harlem vote" line of the GOP leadership. Privately, GOP members, principally from the Middle West, freely admitted that the Southern Democrats like Dies, Willis and Colmer were right in their arguments against the civil rights bill.

A member of the HUMAN EVENTS staff listened to comments of a group of five GOP House members during the voting period and was startled at their strong opposition to the bill. "No measure," said one, "should ever give the Attorney General such broad powers."

While most members discreetly avoided voicing their opposition on the floor, some of the minority exasperation with the bill did break out in the open. The House for days thereafter was talking about Representative Miller (R., N.Y.) who had originally backed the civil rights bill, but who finally made a speech denouncing it as "vicious" and said it reminded him of Hitlerite Germany (Miller served on the staff of the prosecution at the Nuremberg trials). The vote of Republicans against was twenty six — about twice what had been estimated, and included such wheel horses as John Taber, Dewey Short, Noah Mason and many others from the Middle West. (One conservative Northern Democrat, Representative Tumulty, New Jersey, also voted against.)

Profile of Courage: One of the Midwest dissenters against the civil rights measure was Representative August Johansen, Republican of Michigan, who right along has made no secret of his opposition to such legislation. His stand makes it improbable that he can ever aspire to high, elected office, in view of the strong CIO element in his state. Therefore it took some courage in a politician to send the following statement to his constituents (in his newsletter):

"If it were possible — to achieve 'equality' of education or economic opportunity by force of law and government or by complete concentration of governmental power in Washington — I would oppose it. I would do so because everyone — and most of all the very 'minority groups' such action was presumed to benefit — would be tragic losers . . . the simple truth is that governmental police power cannot create equality of this type and cannot enforce conformity in complete disregard of the conflicting prejudices, customs, viewpoints and moral standards of large segments of society."

Illinois: Any "stop Stevenson" movement probably would win at least some support even within Stevenson's home state delegation from Illinois. The state's political spotlight at the moment is focussed on the Republican party's woes stemming from the $1,000,000 scandal swirling around state auditor Orville E. Hodge, who resigned. But the Democratic party in Illinois has its own troubles too.

The Democratic troubles involve intraparty feuding between a Stevenson faction and another group led by former Senator Scott Lucas and former Lieutenant Governor John Stelle, both of whom are regarded as favoring the Presidential aspirations of the dark horse possibility, Senator Stuart Symington.

Defeated for re-election by incumbent Senator Everett Dirksen six years ago, Lucas long has pined for another collision with his successor. The Stevenson forces bypassed him at the state convention in June, however, and gave the Senatorial nomination to State Representative Richard Stengel; some observers in the state believe it was in part because of Lucas' inclination toward Symington.

In any event, the feathers of the Lucas-Stelle faction still are ruffled and Illinois Democrats are far from united. This is one of the few rays of hope Illinois Republicans cling to as they watch the auditor's office mess unfold before the Sangamon County Grand Jury.

Tydings: Election of Mrs. Millard Tydings to be a Maryland delegate to the Democratic national convention in place of her ailing husband, gives credence to persistent rumors that the former Senator will give up the nomination he won in a heated spring primary to oppose incumbent GOP Senator John Marshall Butler.

Tydings has been hospitalized for several weeks, overcoming and then recuperating from, according to official announcements, a case of shingles. Mrs. Tydings has laughed off the constantly recurring rumors that he plans to take himself out of the race.

Last week, however, Tydings did write the State Committee Chairman that his physicians had advised him not to attend the national convention next month, and that he accordingly was resigning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his membership on the delegation; his wife's selection followed this week.

Whether Tydings makes the race or not, Maryland Republicans are considerably more optimistic than they were a few months ago about Butler's chances of winning re-election. They feel his quiet but efficient demeanor has impressed Maryland voters favorably, and that the intraparty Democratic fight which resulted in Tydings' nomination last spring has left a bad taste in the mouths of many Democrats. Observers in the state agree that Butler's chances are looking up.

Dozens of Senators this week arose on the floor and paid tribute to EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, senior Senator of Colorado, who had just announced that he intended to retire after 15 years of distinguished service. The Senator says: "HUMAN EVENTS is a mighty useful reporting service and each week I look forward to its receipt."

China: Both branches of Congress now are on record as expressing unanimously their "unaltered opposition" to admittance of Communist China to the United Nations. A resolution to this effect has been adopted by the House by a vote of 391 to 0; by the Senate, last Monday, by 86 to 0.

An unusual feature of Senate consideration of the resolution was the fact that floor leaders of both parties, Republican William F. Knowland and Democrat Lyndon B. Johnson, urged that their colleagues adopt it without dissent, which was done. Knowland referred to persistent reports that "a nucleus of 'neutrals' such as Yugoslavia and India" plan a move to bring Red China into the UN when its General Assembly meets this November, one week after the American elections.

Reports reaching Washington indicate that some other nations, which had been inclined to go along with the Peiping regime's seating in the General Assembly, are reconsidering their prospective courses. They fear that in view of this resolution, and of even stronger language written into the Foreign Aid appropriation bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee ("Red China," July 21 HUMAN EVENTS), Communist China's admittance might be the spark to touch off the United States' withdrawal from the UN.

That, none of them — even Russia — wants.

Blacklisting: The Fund for the Republic's recent report on blacklisting in the entertainment field already has been assailed by so many different persons and groups, including the House Un-American Activities Committee, that it is widely discredited.

Even liberals are joining the attack, to the point of admitting that it is highly colored to advance the anti-anti-Communist viewpoint which overshadows most Fund for the Republic projects.

For instance, the *AFL-CIO News*, the official weekly publication of that parent labor union organization, invariably presents that organization's "liberal" views on domestic politics. But the Hollywood column in this week's issue says:

"Many in Hollywood, after reading the whole volume, are perplexed. They feel what should have been a factual, objective study became, in its final writing and editing, a document seemingly colored by one viewpoint."

It goes on to attack the report for treating actual Communists "in exactly the same fashion as non-Communists who once were duped into aiding the Communist cause," saying that by so doing the report "actually lends protective coloration to the real, hard-core, disciplined Communist party members" in Hollywood. It further criticizes the report for numerous factual errors, and for refusing to recognize that there has been in the motion picture industry a genuine problem of deeply embedded Communists who have wielded inordinate influence.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence *opens:* "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright, 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 30 HUMAN EVENTS July 28, 1956

Article Section

Profile In Courage: ROBERT A. TAFT

"Liberty of the individual to think his own thoughts."

By SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

THE LATE Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio was never President of the United States. Therein lies his personal tragedy. And therein lies his national greatness.

For the Presidency was a goal that Bob Taft pursued throughout his career in the Senate, an ambition that this son of of a former President always dreamed of realizing. As the leading exponent of the Republican philosophy for more than a decade, "Mr. Republican" was bitterly disappointed by his failure on three different occasions even to receive the nomination.

But Robert A. Taft was also a man who stuck fast to the basic principles in which he believed — and when those fundamental principles were at issue, not even the lure of the White House, or the possibilities of injuring his candidacy, could deter him from speaking out. He was an able politician, but on more than one occasion he chose to speak out in defense of a position no politician with like ambitions would have endorsed. He was, moreover, a brilliant political analyst, who knew that during his lifetime the number of American voters who agreed with the fundamental tenets of his political philosophy was destined to be a permanent minority, and that only by flattering new blocs of support — while carefully refraining from alienating any group which contained potential Taft voters — could he ever hope to attain his goal. Yet he frequently flung to the winds the very restraints his own analysis advised, refusing to bow to any group, refusing to keep silent on any issue.

IN OCTOBER of 1946, Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio was the chief spokesman for the Republicans in Washington, the champion of his party in the national political arena and the likely Republican nominee for the Presidency in 1948. It was a time when even a Senator with such an established reputation for speaking his mind would have guarded his tongue, and particularly a Senator with so much at stake as Bob Taft. The party which had been his whole life, the Republicans of the Congress for whom he spoke, now once again were nearing the brink of success in the fall elections. Capturing for his party control of both Houses of Congress would enhance Bob Taft's prestige, reinforce his right to the Republican Presidential nomination and pave the way for his triumphant return to the White House from which his father had been somewhat ingloriously ousted in 1912. Or so it seemed to most political observers at the time, who assumed the Republican leader would say nothing to upset the applecart. With Congress out of session, with the tide running strongly against the incumbent Democrats, there appeared to be no necessity for the Senator to make more than the usual campaign utterances on the usual issues.

But Senator Taft was disturbed — and when he was disturbed it was his habit to speak out. He was disturbed by the War Crimes Trials of Axis leaders, then concluding in Germany and about to commence in Japan. The Nuremberg Trials, in which eleven notorious Nazis had been found guilty under an impressively documented indictment for "waging an aggressive war," had been popular throughout the world and particularly in the United States. Equally popular was the sentence already announced by the high tribunal: death.

The Constitution of the United States was the gospel which guided the policy decisions of the Senator from Ohio. It was his source, his weapon and his salvation. And when the Constitution commanded no "*ex post facto* laws," Bob Taft accepted this precept as permanently wise and universally applicable. The Constitution was not a collection of

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loosely given political promises subject to broad interpretation. It was not a list of pleasing platitudes to be set lightly aside when expediency required it. It was the foundation of the American system of law and justice and he was repelled by the picture of his country discarding those Constitutional precepts in order to punish a vanquished enemy.

Still, why should he say anything? The Nuremberg Trials were at no time before the Congress for consideration. They were not in any sense an issue in the campaign. There was no Republican or Democratic position on a matter enthusiastically applauded by the entire nation. And no speech by any United States Senator, however powerful, could prevent the death sentence from being carried out. To speak out unnecessarily would be politically costly and clearly futile.

But Bob Taft spoke out.

On October 6, 1946, Senator Taft appeared before a conference on our Anglo-American heritage, sponsored by Kenyon College in Ohio. The war crimes trials were not an issue upon which conference speakers were expected to comment. But titling his address "Equal Justice Under Law" Taft cast aside his general reluctance to embark upon startlingly novel and dramatic approaches. "The trial of the vanquished by the victors," he told an attentive if somewhat astonished audience, "cannot be impartial no matter how it is hedged about with the forms of justice." He said:

> **"I question whether the hanging of those, who, however despicable, were the leaders of the German people, will ever discourage the making of aggressive war, for no one makes aggressive war unless he expects to win. About this whole judgment there is the spirit of vengeance, and vengeance is seldom justice. The hanging of the eleven men convicted will be a blot on the American record which we shall long regret.**
>
> **"In these trials we have accepted the Russian idea of the purpose of trials — government policy and not justice — with little relation to Anglo-Saxon heritage. By clothing policy in the forms of legal procedure, we may discredit the whole idea of justice in Europe for years to come. In the last analysis, even at the end of a frightful war, we should view the future with more hope if even our enemies believed that we had treated them justly in our English-speaking concept of law, in the provision of relief and in the final disposal of territory."**

In ten days, the Nazi leaders were to be hanged. But Bob Taft, speaking in cold, clipped, matter-of-fact tones, deplored that sentence, and suggested that involuntary exile — similar to that imposed upon Napoleon — might be wiser. But even more deplorable, he said, were the trials themselves, which "violate the fundamental principle of American law that a man cannot be tried under an *ex post facto* statute." Nuremberg, the Ohio Senator insisted, was a blot on American Constitutional history, and a serious departure from our Anglo-Saxon heritage of fair and equal treatment, a heritage which had rightly made this country respected throughout the world. "We can't even teach our own people the sound principles of liberty and justice," he concluded. "We cannot teach them government in Germany by suppressing liberty and justice. As I see it, the English-speaking peoples have one great responsibility. That is to restore to the minds of men a devotion to equal justice under law."

The speech exploded in the midst of a heated election campaign; and throughout the nation Republican candidates scurried for shelter while Democrats seized the opportunity to advance. Many, many people were outraged at Taft's remarks. Those who had fought, or whose men had fought and possibly died, to beat back the German aggressors were contemptuous of these fine phrases by a politician who had never seen battle. Those whose kinsmen or former countrymen had been among the Jews, Poles, Czechs and other nationality groups terrorized by Hitler and his cohorts were shocked. The memories of the gas chambers at Buchenwald and other Nazi concentration camps, the stories of hideous atrocities which had been refreshed with new illustrations at Nuremberg, and the anguish and suffering which each new military casualty list had brought to thousands of American homes — these were among the immeasurable influences which caused many to react with pain and indignation when a United States Senator deplored the trials and sentences of these merely "despicable" men.

In New York, the most important state in any Presidential race, and a state where politics were particularly sensitive to the views of various nationality

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and minority groups, Democrats were joyous and Republicans angry and gloomy. The 1944 Republican Presidential nominee, and Taft's bitter rival for party control and the 1948 nomination, New York's Governor Thomas E. Dewey, declared that the verdicts were justified; and in a statement in which the New York Republican nominee for the Senate, Irving Ives, joined, he stated: "The defendants at Nuremberg had a fair and extensive trial. *No one* can have any sympathy for these Nazi leaders who brought such agony upon the world." The Democratic State Campaign Manager in New York challenged Taft "to come into this state and repeat his plea for the lives of the Nazi war criminals. . . ."

> **"The Democratic Party has a perfect right to ask if the public wants the type of national administration, or state administration, favored by Senator Taft, who indicated he wants the lives of the convicted Nazis spared and who may very well be preparing the way for a Republican propaganda campaign to commute the death sentence of the Nazi murderers."**

New York Republican Congressional candidate Jacob K. Javits sent a telegram to Taft calling his statement "a disservice to all we fought for and to the cause of future peace." The Democratic nominee for United States Senator in New York expressed his deep shock at the Taft statement and his certainty it would be repudiated by "right-thinking and fair-minded Americans." And the Democratic nominee for Governor told his audiences that if Senator Taft had ever seen the victims of Nazi concentration camps, he never would have been able to make such a statement.

EVEN IN THE nation's Capital, where Taft was greatly admired and his blunt candor was more or less expected, the reaction was no different. GOP leaders generally declined official comment, but privately expressed their fears over the consequences for their Congressional candidates. At a press conference, the Chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee refused to comment on the subject, stating that he had "his own ideas" on the Nuremberg trials but did not "wish to enter into a controversy with Senator Taft."

The Democrats, however, were jubilant — although concealing their glee behind a facade of shocked indignation. At his weekly press conference, President Truman smilingly suggested he would be glad to let Senator Taft and Governor Dewey fight the matter out. Democratic Majority Leader in the Senate (and later Vice President) Alben Barkley of Kentucky told a campaign audience that Taft "never experienced a crescendo of heart about the soup kitchens of 1932, but his heart bled anguishedly for the criminals at Nuremberg." Typical of Democratic reaction was the statement of Senator Scott Lucas of Illinois, who called Taft's speech "a classical example of his muddled and confused thinking" and predicted it would "boomerang on his aspirations for the Presidential nomination of 1948."

> **"11,000,000 fighting veterans of World War II will answer Mr. Taft. . . . I doubt that the Republican National Chairman will permit the Senator to make any more speeches now that Taft had called the trials a blot on the American record. . . . Neither the American people nor history will agree. . . . Senator Taft, whether he believed it or not, was defending these culprits who were responsible for the murder of ten million people."**

Even in Taft's home bailiwick of Ohio, where his strict constitutionalism had won him immense popularity, the Senator's speech brought anger, confusion and political reverberations. The Republican Senatorial candidate, former Governor John Bricker, was not only a close ally of Taft but had been the Vice-Presidential nominee in 1944 as running mate to Governor Dewey. His Democratic opponent, incumbent Senator James Huffman, challenged Bricker to stand with either Taft or Dewey, declaring:

> **"A country that has suffered the scourge of modern war, lost more than 300,000 of its finest men, and spent $300,000,000,000 of its resources because of the acts of these convicted gangsters can never feel that the sentences meted out have been too severe. . . . This is not the time to weaken in the punishment of international crimes. Such criticism, even if justified, should have been offered when the international tribunals were being set up."**

The Toledo *Blade* told its readers that "on this issue, as on so many others, Senator Taft shows that he has a wonderful mind which knows practically everything and understands practically nothing. . . ."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cleveland *Plain Dealer* editorialized that Taft "may be technically correct," but turning "loose on the world the worst gang of cutthroats in all history . . . would have failed to give the world that great principle which humanity needs so desperately to have established: the principle that planning and waging aggressive war is definitely a crime against humanity."

Senator Taft was disheartened by the voracity of his critics — and extremely uncomfortable when one of the Nazi leaders, Franz von Papen, told interviewers upon his release from prison that he agreed with Taft's speech. A spokesman for Taft issued only one terse statement: "He has stated his feelings on the matter and feels that if others want to criticize him, let them go ahead." But the Ohio Senator could not understand why even his old supporter, newspaper columnist David Lawrence, called his position nothing more than a "technical quibble." And he must have been particularly distressed when respected Constitutional authorities such as the President of the American Bar Association, the Chairman of its Executive Committee and other leading members of the legal profession all deplored his statement and defended the trials as being in accordance with international law.

For Robert Taft had spoken, not in "defense of the Nazi murderers" (as a labor leader charged), not in defense of isolationism (as most observers assumed), but in defense of what he regarded to be the traditional American concepts of law and justice. As the apostle of strict constitutionalism, as the chief defense attorney for the conservative way of life and government, Robert Alphonso Taft was undeterred by the possibilities of injury to his party's precarious position or his own Presidential prospects. To him, justice was at stake, and all other concerns were trivial. "It illustrates at once," a columnist observed at that time, "the extreme stubbornness, integrity and political strongheadedness of Senator Taft."

> **"The fact that thousands disagreed with him, and that it is politically embarrassing to other Republicans, probably did not bother Taft at all. He has for years been accustomed to making up his mind, regardless of whether it hurts him or anyone else. Taft surely must have known that his remarks would be twisted and misconstrued and that his timing would raise the devil in the current campaign. But it is characteristic of him that he went ahead anyway."**

The storm raised by his speech eventually died down. It did not, after all the uproar, appear to affect the Republican sweep in 1946, nor was it — at least openly — an issue in Taft's drive for the Presidential nomination in 1948. The Nazi leaders were hanged, and Taft and the country went on to other matters. But we are not concerned today with the question of whether Taft was right or wrong in his condemnation of the Nuremberg trials. What is noteworthy is the illustration furnished by this speech of Taft's unhesitating courage in standing against the flow of public opinion for a cause he believed to be right. His action was characteristic of the man who was labeled a reactionary, who was proud to be a conservative and who authored these lasting definitions of liberalism and liberty:

> **"Liberalism implies particularly freedom of thought, freedom from orthodox dogma, the right of others to think differently from one's self. It implies a free mind, open to new ideas and willing to give attentive consideration. . . .**
>
> **"When I say liberty, I mean liberty of the individual to think his own thoughts and live his own life as he desires to think and live."**

This was the creed by which Senator Taft lived, and he sought in his own fashion and in his own way to provide an atmosphere in America in which others could do likewise.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

JOHN F. KENNEDY is the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts. He is the author of *Why England Slept*, written in 1940. He is the son of Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain.

This article is a chapter from the book *Profiles in Courage*, published by Harper & Brothers (N.Y.), $3.50.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED